



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

at least equally possible may be adduced to account for such deities, and, even granting "transformation" as a factor, the change from male to female at the agricultural stage in the life of a people when the conception of a great mother goddess would naturally arise, is to say the least more plausible than the transformation from female to male because of the supposed superior position accorded to man in the course of social development. A connection between economic conditions and religious beliefs, with which proposition Barton starts out, undoubtedly exists, but such connection is to be sought in the *forms* of the cult and not in the domain of beliefs themselves which rest rather upon a primitive logic and upon crude methods of speculation as to the relationship of the individual to the powers which manifest themselves on all sides of him. While therefore rejecting Barton's main contention, thanks are due to him for having amassed such valuable material for the study of Semitic antiquities. As already indicated his work is a contribution of decided value to this study and whatever the ultimate solution (if any) will be of the problem upon which he touches, his work will be indispensable to students and is to be warmly recommended as a most suggestive discussion of an important theme.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM: LIFE AND WORK. By J. A. Hobson.  
London: James Nisbet & Co. Pp. x., 295.

This work is divided into two parts. The first deals with "the science of social progress," the second with "the art of social progress." The first part is critical and the second part is constructive.

In the first part the author seems to go out of his way to bring sweeping charges against the economists, the old and the new. To Mr. Hobson the economists are very much like King Charles' head to Mr. Dick. It seems a pity that he should weaken what of interest and importance he has to say by burying it in a mass of unnecessary criticism which most of his readers must regard as extravagant. With Professor Marshall he is very severe. He will not allow him to break up a "social problem" into parts because it is organic—what would the biologists say to this, I wonder!

But when our author descends to detail he shows a complete misunderstanding of the nature of the preliminary analysis which Professor Marshall makes. "No doubt 'common sense' and Professor Marshall find it more convenient to break up an organic whole into a number of inorganic (sic!) parts for study. It is so much simpler, so much easier. Let us, then, pretend that man is actuated by one or two strong dominant motives (though we know he is not)" (p. 62). Professor Marshall is apparently charged with postulating the vulgar "economic man" made notorious and contemptible, and largely created, by Ruskin. It is very perverse and unkind of Mr. Hobson to bring this charge after Professor Marshall has taken such pains to explain clearly at the outset of his great work the nature of the abstraction of which he proposes to make use. His standpoint, I should say, ought to be perfectly apparent to anybody who takes the trouble to try to understand his system. It will perhaps be some solace to "the Nestor of economics" that he has not to bear the lash alone. "Like Professor Marshall, Dr. Keynes wants to simplify by falsification" (p. 69). Mr. Hobson objects to Dr. Keynes' distinction between a positive and normative standpoint. He argues that "an ought" is everywhere the highest "aspect or relation of an 'is'" (p. 66), and in this he is right. But it is absurd to suppose that you cannot in any sense separate the ethical and naturalistic points of view: it is like arguing that the chemistry of dyeing is necessarily a branch of æsthetics because colors are beautiful. What our author says of the old Political Economy is enough to make the economists from Adam Smith to Cairnes, Mill and Jevons turn in their graves. They were "bad company" in the extreme, and it is a mercy that their evil communications have not corrupted our good manners more than they have.

On turning to Book II one gets more into sympathy with the author of "The Social Problem" though one may not agree with most of his statements. One feels his intense interest and earnestness, and it cannot be denied that his treatment is stimulating and suggestive. But it leads to very little and one feels that its ineffectiveness is largely due to the restrictions which our author has imposed upon himself by his criticisms in Book I. In Book II, Mr. Hobson sets out to say something helpful on the biggest problem of the age. He discusses important questions in a manner which shows that he feels their importance.

Much of Book II is very real and the serious student will gain from examining it.

S. J. CHAPMAN.

THE OWENS COLLEGE, MANCHESTER.

DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY, ETC. Written by many hands and edited by James Mark Baldwin, Ph. D., etc., etc., Stuart Professor in Princeton University, with the co-operation and assistance of an international board of consulting editors; in three volumes, with illustrations and extensive bibliographies. Quarto. Vol. I., pp. xxiv., 643. New York and London: Macmillan, 1901.

The task of making a useful dictionary of philosophy is probably one of the most difficult that an author or a company of authors can undertake. The width of the subject and the indefiniteness of its limits render almost insoluble the problem of rightly selecting the topics and treating them in due proportion. Past experience has also tended to make one sceptical regarding the success of any new attempt; for while most of the previous dictionaries have occasional utility and some peculiar merits, none of them can be implicitly trusted, and all of them, in one way or another, seriously mislead the unwary reader. Many faults of the older dictionaries are, however, due to the fact that each of them is mainly the work of one man. This new book is "written by many hands," and one's expectation is consequently renewed. Yet a perusal of the first volume leaves me with a scepticism shaken, but not removed. It may yet be possible to produce a fairly satisfactory dictionary of philosophy (including metaphysics, logic, ethics and æsthetics), and another fairly satisfactory dictionary of psychology (including various allied sciences). But the present work seems to me to fail in the attempt to combine the two. So far as I am competent to judge, philosophy suffers most. It practically becomes ancillary to psychology and the whole work should be entitled rather "a dictionary of psychology and philosophy" than "a dictionary of philosophy and psychology." To many people this may appear right and proper; but it is a view which I cannot accept. It expresses, however, in another way the statement of the editor in his preface that "it is upon the psychology of this work that most of its lines converge; and it is in its psychology that many of the hopes